

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEONARD SCARBROUGH,
Plaintiff,
v.
VILADES, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:25-cv-1214-JDP (P)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On September 3, 2025, I screened plaintiff's first amended complaint and dismissed it for failure to state a claim. ECF No. 11. I ordered plaintiff to file, within thirty days, either an amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal of this action. *Id.* To date, plaintiff has not responded.

The court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal. *Bautista v. Los Angeles Cnty.*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000); *see* Local Rule 110 ("Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court."). A court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 I will give plaintiff a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss the case for his
2 failure to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute
3 another failure to comply with a court order and will result in a recommendation that this action
4 be dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show cause within fourteen days why this case
5 should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, failure to comply with court orders, and failure to
6 state a claim. Should plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall file, within fourteen
7 days, an amended complaint.

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: December 5, 2025


JEREMY D. PETERSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE